

Ref No.	Respondant				To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following aspects of the councils draft Estates Local Plan?													How did you hear about this consultation?					Other information	
	Estate	Tenancy	Which of the following describes you: you - Other (e.g. other register provider tenant; living near the estate; do not want to say)	Which of the following describes your client: - Other (e.g. other register provider tenant; living near the estate; do not want to say)	Having read and considered the councils draft Estates Local Plan and supporting documents please indicate your preference at this stage for regeneration	Townscape	Street Network	Movement and access	Land use	Open space	Environmental protection	Landscape	Building heights	Open-Ended Response	Email	Letter	Website	Newspaper	Other (please specify)	Other - Specify	How well did you understand the councils draft Estates Local Plan?	Do you have any other comments about the councils consultation process that you would like considered?		
78	HP	Freeholder			Option 3	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	For the amount of effort being created for the desired outcome is, in my opinion, not beneficial. Current maintenance is somewhat to be desired. I have no trust in the way Circle Housing are currently handling Highpath Estate. I strongly agree to option 3 - refurbish all circle housing merton priory and leasehold properties to ensure they meet current minimum housing standard, and have reasonable kitchens, bathrooms, windows, wiring and insulation.	Yes						Very well	My support for investment in existing properties and to bring the estate to minimum modern standard, to keep the area safe for old people and to manage antisocial behaviour.		
79	HP	Freeholder			Option 1	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree		Yes						Reasonably well			
80	HP	Freeholder			Option 1	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	1. I am concerned about your plans to build 7-9 storey buildings along Morden Road. The new 9 storey building there is an absolute monstrosity. Occupants of the top floors of those flats can look straight into the bedroom in our house and all other houses in the area so we no longer have any privacy. The extra 2 storeys on top make a huge difference in this respect and I want you to change your plans to restrict all high-rise buildings to 7 storeys at maximum. 2. I am concerned about parking. Where are you going to put parking spaces for all the new residents of High Path Estate?	Yes						Very well				
81	HP	Freeholder			Option 3	Agree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Preamble: I do not give consent to full regeneration proposals for High Path Estate. I do not wish perfectly good structurally sound freehold townhouse buildings to be demolished. Who specifically holds final responsibility for 1) London Borough of Merton Draft Estates Local Plan and 2) Regeneration planning permission? VALUE FOR MONEY and VALUE FOR PROPERTY - based on the number of bedrooms which do not have comparable sizes with existing townhouses. We require the same footprint size or larger 4ft that is the length and width of the plot. This point must be factored into future Merton Local E - in the specifications and drawings should be the same or larger. Landing space, stair width, bathrooms, toilets, living rooms, bedrooms, storage rooms, kitchen, garden space, garage space, and on plot parking space. CONTENTMENT: we require to be content with - Structure, plan of building - Individual services on each property for gas, electricity and water. - Recycling and rubbish space for collection close to the houses and not one huge for all. - Does it feel right emotionally? London Borough of Merton Draft Estates Local Plan does not show enough townhouse allocation to cater for existing number of townhouses on High Path. Draft Estate Local Plan for High Path should not be just about buildings, streets, open spaces and surrounding areas and visual appearances. Draft Estate Local Plan survey does not include questions relevant to leaseholders and freeholders adversely affected by this exercise. All tenants remain unaffected by the housing changes due to the resident offer to them but not to the other two categories whose change in housing situation entail reduction in equity and financial burdens greater than their existing as well as threaten inheritance and or survival as a family. Do Councillors and or Merton Council have a duty to uphold the financial wealth and general well-being of all the community, including	Yes						Reasonably well	Will aim to supply a paper copy version as well.			
82	HP	Leaseholder private			Option 1				Neither agree nor disagree															
83	HP	Freeholder			Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	New development on the Abbey road side should not exceed 3 stories as this would be in keeping with the surrounding areas of Meadow rd etc. where houses are that height.	Yes							Very well	I am in favour of these plans - regeneration is much needed in this area - especially to support future improvements to the high street.		
84	HP	Circle tenant			Option 2	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	In relation to H6 - Environmental protection. 3.188: Redevelopment needs very much to take into consideration the affects of climatic change. Therefore the closeness of the River Wandle which is near the fluvial flood plain ought to have a bearing on any new works. Also in relation to 3.189 Air pollution will increase because of the increase of vehicle flow in the area and this particularly needs to be considered when drawing on physical traffic calming measures and or new roads as highlighted in 3.148 - 3.154. There is an urgent need for cycle paths and footpaths to encourage environmentally modes of movement. Delivery and implementation: One of the contentious issues of a regeneration or redevelopment of an area as substantial as The High Path Estate is the retaining of its community. It is imperative that the Council ensure within each Planning Application residents are given the opportunity to return to the area that they resided in before the works began. Governments and local councils change politically and with that can be a change of heart. Also mergers of companies can sometimes affect a contract (CHMP are talks for a merger with Affinity Sutton), especially with building sub contractors so I would strongly suggest that every contingency is thought of in view of this and that CHMP are held to account every step of the way. More specifically with the procurement of its contractors for this new, and epic venture. An 'open book' of its accounting and regulated procurement is the minimum of that requirement. Design Code: One of the reasons that I would agree for the partial redevelopment to go ahead is that the depressed state of the fabric of the buildings has left the landlord (CHMP) with no choice but to redevelop as opposed to maintain; specifically in the lower blocks, Marsh, May and Hudson Court. The materials used for these builds have not been able to withstand the overbearing use due to the overcrowding in some cases of the dwellings. To compound this the materials were not built with sufficient ventilation in mind and as a consequence of this many families have had to endure						Other (please specify)	Future Merton	Very well	Why didn't you involve the Residents' Associations in the drafting of the questions? Similarly to questions in CHMP's survey via MES, some questions in this, like #1 are leading.	
85	HP	Leaseholder private			Option 1	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Disagree	There is not enough detail in many instances to agree or disagree.					Other (please specify)	Meetings and direct mailings, and door knocking event from our local Councillors	Reasonably well	I appreciate that the Council is advocating on behalf of the residents and that if the Council had not sold off their housing stock in 2010 that we would be adversaries. Thank you to Merton Council, Future Merton and the Abbey Ward Councillors.		
86	HP	Other	Owner of property on High Path (Colborne Court)		Option 1	Agree	Strongly agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Building heights should be lower generally. I strongly object to loss of parking on the High Path estate which will simply shift parking pressures onto neighbouring areas and streets. I also believe that the opportunity provided by redeveloping the High Path estate should be used to identify and implement a permanent solution to the issue of vehicles using Abbey Road as a rat run. This is likely to be by far the best chance for decades to address this issue which is a serious problem for various roads around the High Path estate, including High Path itself.			Yes				Reasonably well				
87	HP	Circle tenant			Option 2	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	NO DIRECT PROVISION FOR ADAPTIONS, THIS SCHEME LACKS THOUGHT WHEN CONSIDER DISABILITY. NO REPRESENTATION EITHER.					Other (please specify)	By accident	Reasonably well	DISABILITY REPRESENTATION NOT TAKEN GESTURES, AND A PROPER DRAFT DRAWING OF A DISABLED UNIT.		

88 HP	High Path		I live near the estate					Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	The plan mentions underground parking. It is essential that enough parking is provided, of course.		Yes							Very well	Keen NOT to have tall buildings on Abbey Road. Would also be great to see some regeneration of the High Street, but that would I guess come, if the development of High Path were successfully completed.						
89 HP	High Path	Leaseholder private						Option 3	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	No indication of programme.		Yes							Reasonably well	I am a private individual who is renting out my property. In light of the income stream that my property represents and in respect of the governments recent stamp duty tax revisions on second property purchases, the current compensation plans will not meet requirements to adequately replace this asset. I am happy to be contacted directly to discuss this further.						
90 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 1	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Too much glass being used. What is the obsession with having glass everywhere? It doesn't retain heat very well and I am concerned that neither will these homes. I haven't seen much plans to increase parking capacity but there are certainly plans to increase open spaces. How will waste be looked after? I can't really see any of that in the plan. I just don't want to see a new pretty estate with the same shoddy service that we've been getting from Circle who will probably try to merge with someone else and pawn it off onto them at some point. I really hope you have the best interests of your residents at heart...		Yes								Not very well	Make it more transparent and nail down a plan which leaves no doubt as to how you might be proceeding when the green light is received...					
91 HP	High Path	Leaseholder private						Option 2	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	none		Yes						Very well	none						
92 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 1	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	I believe that the community would like to see the regeneration process start and would be ideal for families and the rest of the community		Yes							Reasonably well							
93 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 2	Strongly agree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Disagree	I do not agree with demolishing the estate. This would disturb the community and the area is already populated and busy enough.		Yes						Reasonably well							
94 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Excellent layout and careful planning.		Yes						Very well	Personally I haven't been to many of the meetings as I don't see anything wrong with improvements to the estate, the meetings I have attended have been well planned and everyone I have spoken to are very helpful.						
95 HP	High Path	Leaseholder private						Option 1	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree			Yes						Reasonably well							
96 HP	High Path	Private tenant						Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree			Yes						Very well							
97 HP	High Path	Leaseholder private						Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Disagree	Generally agree except for building heights which should be lower. There is nothing in the plan about density of occupied space and the number of units to be built. Density should be low and number of units small.		Yes	Yes					Reasonably well	There is generally the impression that consultation is pro forma and that it does not offer a genuine opportunity to collaborate in the design of the new space. This is not opposition to improvement which is welcome.						
98 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 1	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree			Yes						Reasonably well							
99 HP	High Path	Freeholder						Option 1	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree			Yes						Reasonably well							
100 HP	High Path	Other	I live near the estate					Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	I propose that a pedestrian crossing be put by the corner of Merantun Way and Morden Road, by the corner of Nelson Gardens, crossing Morden Road. This would mean that High Path residents could walk through Nelson Gardens, easily cross a busy road and enjoy the green spaces - Abbey Recreation Grounds and the nature reserve, Merton Park Green Walk.	Other (please specify)			ward councillor			Reasonably well	no							
002 HP	HIGH PATH	Other	Carer for Mother					Option 3	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	The question 8 does not make sense or give proper options, and is potentially incorrect as to the type of works to existing blocks that leaseholders will have to share in as the amount of works to common parts have not been costed or assessed as to how, when or where these will be needed to properly maintain, or improve the fabric of the buildings. The Anodyne Box type properties proposed do not respect adjoining older properties. The landscape is unspecified, the relation to, and problems of constraint of site by Meretun way (appears to be ambulate businesses and offices and detached houses to create new roads), Abbey Road (ditto but residents in Abbey Road might have further issues with cut-through traffic). South Wimbledon Tube Station (it unduly dominates rather than potentially integrates like Clapham South Station). Possibility of Flats over an otherwise retained Dark House pub. Possibility of why not statement tower blocks in bold colours in the centre of the estate - maybe existing re-clad and re-worked at ground level to improve and break-up the high winds that prevail. Tower blocks are a visual statement, providing key view from afar including St George's Hospital wards, Alexander Road Wairore, Roads down Wimbledon Hill, giving a sense of 'home' to the place. Notes on Condition Survey appear incomplete- and possibly inaccurate, housing needs statement is difficult to read and understand and does not consider property disabilities. Potential loss of usable size of existing property is not properly dealt with, no size of existing appears to have been made available for all types of existing. Loss of gentle curve into Rodney Place is regrettable. Loss of cul-de-sac for road at Will Miles Court is regrettable. Plan appears to condemn existing buildings in a way the methodology was not designed for- and I can demonstrate that new build in last three years does not meet the straight-jacket the merton council appears to favour. Private flat developments in the area immediately have caused space waste of the likes of duplicated amenity spaces - potential to introduce daily waste collections from fewer community bins		Yes												Not very well	Survey should be specific to each estate. M&S survey appears ignored (although that did not ask or have enough information for proper disaggregated analysis of results. have your say events a mis-nomer there were no short hand / audio typists provided to take verbal or summarised comments or responses from people attending. Development planners appear operating in silos. with no integration of existing funding or work streams, eg Merton High Street works ignored access improvements by foot or cycle into High Path that could have taken place within the bid. The loss of democratic control over Merton's Authority provided housing solutions means duplication of effort, lack of transparency within Circle, and much ignored resident feedback. Some of the estates plan could work - for example - at Saddler Close, Mitcham, which does have problems, but for High Path the council is desperately trying to find problems that the residents do not actually have (other than some vertical access issues to 3/4 storey blocks). Note within the documents, printed at least 7 errors of fact, and supporting downloads riddled with spelling errors and other areas where opinion is presented as fact, and lack of proper alternative choices.
102 HP	High Path	Circle tenant						Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Personally I think the drafts for High Path are very well thought out with all different elements taken into consideration.	Other (please specify)								Very well	I am replying to this questionnaire as I have just received a Merton Council pack, I have also been seeing posters around the estate when events are coming up.						
103 HP	High Path	Freeholder						Option 2	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	I live on Meadow road, off Abbey Road and increasing the heights of buildings along that road will make the area feel even more enclosed and unfriendly. The existing heights of buildings should be retained. Also abbey road is already ridiculously busy with car traffic in mornings an evenings and the cars speed down our road for a short cut as a result, changing the estate and number of people living there will only increase this traffic further not address this problem. I can see no details of the number of houses to be built but drastically increasing the number of people in the area will put many extra pressures on the area in general and spoil what is generally a nice quiet area.		Yes								Very well	I am a fan of the Trafalgar pub. It is very friendly and good community local. It should not be impacted negatively by any changes. The Nelson arms on the other hand is a very unfriendly place to even walk past in the evening and seems to attract some unpleasant people. Something should be done about it if possible.					

104 HP	High Path	Leaseholder - private					Option 1	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	EP H1 Townscape Current mention of a 4m wide 'green corridor' along the street ... with buildings with entrances and windows facing the street. 4m wide 'green corridor' possibly good, possibly bad. Any continuous building line fronting the street should be set back from the road itself, allowing retention of the existing 8m 'open space' feel to the area. Setting back will allow scope for incorporation of design features along Merton High Street that would enhance the vibrancy of the local area, e.g. limited parking to allow access to local retailers, but stops that are off the main traffic flow of Merton High Street, an upgraded cycle lane routing towards Cycle Superhighway 7, cycle parking for South Wimbledon underground station, etc. Setting back will also allow scope for potential environment and landscaping considerations that will improve the area. 5. EP H5 Environmental protection and EP H7 Landscape The existing mature trees and open space on Merton High Street to the east of Pincoff Road should be mirrored by grassing the existing open space to the west of Pincoff Road and planting new trees, retaining and further enhancing the feel of a 'green corridor' in what is otherwise a very urban road. EP H8 Building heights Buildings on south side of Merton High Street should be limited to three storeys (not 4 to 5 storeys as currently proposed) in order to mirror buildings on the north side of Merton High Street to avoid creating a 'tunnelled' feel to the road and to prevent excessive blocking of sunlight.	Yes								Reasonably well	
105 HP	High Path	Leaseholder - private					Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	I think the entire high path needs demolishing and re-done. It looks like a total dump and is quite clearly not been addressed for many years. I live in a block of flats which were built in 2007 and look quite nice, and it's totally ruined by what's around it, including the 3 big round tower blocks which make the entire area look like a nuclear waste site, although there is much worse out there but if the opportunity is there to re-build it then '1 from me. The road behind my flat is the high path road, where there is a car wash, council house block amongst other things. The only thing I would not alter or demolish the primary school as that has recently been upgraded. Other than that the roads, other properties on that road and so on, should disappear. Considering how close it is to South Wimbledon station it should be an attraction not a dump.	Yes							Reasonably well		
106 HP	High Path	Freeholder					Option 1	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	HIGH PATH ESTATE MOVEMENT AND ACCESS 1/ TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT also needs to be addressed in this consultation. Please consider the traffic management in this area and correct the issues at the Northbound junction of Morden Road and Merton High Street. - There is currently no dedicated turning lane or traffic management strategy for assisting the right turn onto Merton High Street. This causes traffic to build up on the southside of the junction and encourages northbound traffic to divert into residential streets via Merantun way, through High Path via Abbey/Dane/Meadow/Croft/Mill roads to access Merton High Street. On a weekday, commuters will race through these residential streets in an attempt to bypass the junction of Morden Road and Merton High Street and to rejoin Merton High Street and/or to access Haydon Road, creating long queues of traffic down Abbey or Mill Road through Dane Road and to High Path. - Please improve the traffic management on the Morden Road and Merton High Street so that residents are not subject to cars racing through residential streets. 2/ CAR PARKING must be properly addressed for this development as the estate is currently uncontrolled. The proposed development must consider the creation of a separate controlled parking zone (CPZ) to minimise the impact of parking overflow/spillover to the surrounding streets. - Utilisation of parking in CPZ SW19 and the surrounding area is high and nearing or at its limit capacity. The proposed development should not be allowed to spill over into existing CPZs. - What ratio of parking spaces (per new household) will be made available through the provision of basement parking. - Will on-street parking spaces be controlled or uncontrolled parking and how the development intends to limit the impact of overflow parking on surrounding streets (e.g. create a separate CPZ for the estate). 3/ CYCLE SUPERHIGHWAY (CS7). A great opportunity exists for the proposed development to show off its green credentials by providing adequate bicycle cages and other lockup facilities, to encourage cyclists to utilise CS7 on their doorstep. I would	Yes							Reasonably well	This consultation for the proposed High Path Estate cannot be made in isolation of the local amenities and connecting infrastructure. Improvements need to be made to these services to ensure the success of this development - South Wimbledon Station - Improved traffic flow for Morden Road/Merton High Street Junction - Improved traffic flow on Morden Road - Improved traffic flow on Merton High Street - Improved cycle lockup facilities for any new retail shops	
107 HP	High Path	Circle tenant					Option 1	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	I have had many problems with priory homes. My point being that I don't not trust this association and wish we had remained with the council. Poor repairs management, years to complete repairs, and the need to involve my local MP. This has led to a lack of trust in Priory Homes. I am not alone, neighbors that are both tenants and leaseholders have had poor experiences too. I do not trust Priory homes to act in our benefit and believe Redevelopment is just a ploy to line the own pockets.	Letter						Reasonably well			
108 HP	High Path	Circle tenant					Option 3	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Hurry up and knock them down	Letter									
109 HP	HIGH PATH	Freeholder					Option 2	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	With reference to the report detailing High Path: I have many issues with this report. It mentions ideas but not answers. The local plan is at best a starting point. 1. The creation of new roads on P-103 is a negative and disappointing issue. Fewer roads should be created in a society (and city) needing to rely more on public transport and less on cars. Your suggestion that streets are 'ill-defined' on P.92 is humorous. Please inform me what defines a road? Personally, Nelson Grove Rd is well defined. Streets on the north side of Merton High St have bollards to stop access. Why would we be interested in increasing access to Merantun Way and thus increasing traffic and the number of 'rat runs' through the estate. It is an absurd idea. Unless you build a diagonal street, your suggestions do not increase the speed in which one can walk to the tube. As is there are three entrances onto the estate and three exits. This benefits people here as it stops overuse by those not living at High Path. 2. I am disappointed that the historical photos looked at do not include those from Nelson Grove Rd or even photos from the last remaining historical house on Nelson Grove Rd (68) that give a better representation of the character of the area used to be and should be. P.81 showing Merton High St from 1910 has no implications on today's road network as the street is a through road and heavily used by large vehicles, buses and ambulances heading to St Georges. It is in no way scenic or even has the potential to be due to this traffic and it being an important trunk road. 3. P.94 shows Analysis & Planning Policies and suggests the three towers have a negative townscape. This is not necessarily true and needs to be compared to the idea that what's replacing them will be better. For me personally who enjoys the long views and my right to light, having 3 storey houses adjacent to 68 Nelson Grove Rd, a new new road formed down the side of my property and houses with direct lines of sight into my property is much more negative than what we currently have. Other on Rodney Place also agree that it is better to have the wide open spaces. 4. P.96 Land analysis. The report is comical		Friendly neighbour, shocking that living on the estate we were not informed via a letter drop.			Reasonably well	The design of the estate should be geared to reducing cars, increasing public transport and green spaces. As with designs in other major cities ebs Stockholm, Berlin, buildings 7 storeys high tend to have large communal green spaces in the centre of the complexes.				